



Rita Moreno <rita.moreno@lacity.org>

Re: URGENT: Need your help

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Tue, Jun 21, 2016 at 11:19 PM

To: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Cc: Tyler Kim <tylerthkim@gmail.com>, Dennis Rader <Dennis.Rader@lacity.org>, Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>, Ed Henning <mred2@earthlink.net>, Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>, Rita Moreno <rita.moreno@lacity.org>

We are fine with the changes.

I completed MDP revisions tonight with the exception of a few items that I take directly from Ed's ER, and a final pass at pagination/cross-references to make sure they are all current and that there are no awkward page breaks, etc.

Ed is working on the ER now.

If we encounter no unforeseen issues, I expect to submit revised MDP/ER before 11am on Weds (will provide sooner if possible.)

Thank you all for all your help.

On Jun 21, 2016 4:29 PM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:

Hello tara,

Attached is the corrected Venice Beach BID database.

Below, I point out the changes, all of which are highlighted in light green in the spreadsheet:

+ 4286008001- on the original list of modifications- change verified and incorporated into database

+ 4286009091 & 092 - on the original list of modifications- changes verified and incorporated into database

+ 4286012041 - split into 044 & 045- on the original list of modifications- changes verified and incorporated into database

+ 4286028021 to 031- on the original list of modifications- the two buildings involved in this APN range prompted the discussions about methodology, with ultimately no METHODOLOGY changes made . HOWEVER, in the process of looking these parcels over, I noticed that the "original" numbers in the database did not follow the methodology in the MDP when it came to lot frontage and lot area. I corrected these figures

+ 4286027015 to 019- like the immediately preceding group of APNs, the wrong methodology had been applied to lot size and frontage, I corrected those.

+ 4286017026 to 093- similar to the two immediately preceding groups of APNs, the wrong methodology had been applied to frontage, I corrected those figures. The resulting changes in assessments are minimal, with only 093 increasing, and the others decreasing.

+ 4286009135 & 136- these two APNs appeared on the assessor's maps; upon verification in the county's database, it turned out they were added in April; I have added them to the database along with lot, frontage, and building data with

the resulting assessments

+ 4286009070 to 075 and 077-081- when I was attending to the previous two additions, 135 & 136 (above), I noticed that an incorrect divisor (12 units instead of 11 had been used), an understandable error since there is no 076, throwing off the count. I adjusted for that along with the two new parcels so the lot and frontage allocation changed for all the parcels in this building. All previous assessment figures decreased.

+ 4286009074 & 081- these are the two parcels I left a voice mail about. They were tagged as zone one, but the building is in zone two, and all the other units in it are tagged as zone two. I also tagged the two new parcels (135 & 136) as zone 2.

I'm pretty sure I've covered everything. Let me know if I have not been clear about any of these points.

Garen

On Tue, Jun 21, 2016 at 9:00 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

We made the changes late last night and sent the revised database just before midnight. We are awaiting final review.

On Jun 21, 2016 7:46 AM, "Miranda Paster" <miranda.paster@lacity.org> wrote:
Good Morning.

Garen finished his review and indicated that you are planning to undo some changes to 2 buildings. He finished the review of Ed's changes from last week on yesterday. Dennis is out today.

What else can we do for you?

Thank you.

On Mon, Jun 20, 2016 at 12:40 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

We are going to lose 3 weeks minimum if the database is not approved asap. We cannot final the ER and MDP until we have an approved database - every table, and many of the in-line numbers change with any change to the database.

My understanding is that Weds is the last day to get this item in the queue to go to Council before a 3-week recess.

Failure to go to Council before recess greatly increases our chances of the BID not starting services on Jan 1 - an outcome that is going to make my head roll, and is going to deeply disappoint the BID's many supporters.

I know Ed is unavailable Tuesday due to medical issues - and I can make some of his ER edit for him, but not all of them.

Please, all, I am asking for your help. This is my top priority; I will do anything within my power. Whatever is easiest and most expedient is really needed, now.

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
[310.430.5121](tel:310.430.5121)
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

—
Counting my blessings - Sing and be Happy Today!

http://clerk.lacity.org/stellent/groups/departments/@clerk_master_contributor/documents/contributor_web_content/lacityp_026712.png

—
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621



Rita Moreno <rita.moreno@lacity.org>

Re: URGENT: Need your help

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Wed, Jun 22, 2016 at 7:38 AM

To: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Cc: Tyler Kim <tylerthkim@gmail.com>, Dennis Rader <Dennis.Rader@lacity.org>, Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>, Ed Henning <mred2@earthlink.net>, Miranda Paster <miranda.paster@lacity.org>, Rita Moreno <rita.moreno@lacity.org>

We have an issue that we are, thus far, unable to resolve. Ed and I have taken the MDP and ER as far as we can go without solving this. We have each dedicated several hours (in addition to the MDP and ER edits) to try to solve this and have been unsuccessful. Garen - if you would take a look and see if you can see something we're missing, we'd appreciate it.

The GREEN table at the bottom left of the main tab "VB Assessments" -- which, in turn feeds the 4th and 5th tabs -- no longer works on the version that was returned to us yesterday (not attached since we have not altered it.) I have looked at all of the formulas and they all appear correct, so I cannot figure out why they are not working. The green table feeds a very important table in the 4th tab "Assessment Source" of the spreadsheet for the MDP (and affects Ed's work even more extensively) I am really struggling to figure out why these tables are now generating a total budget (1st tab, cell I494) that is about \$24K less than the correct total (1st tab, cell BJ470.)

I am attaching here the last version that we sent to the Clerk (Monday night) - at this time, the green table and the 4th tab were working and fully in sync with the main assessment total.

We cannot do anything further until this is resolved. This leaves me with a missing set of tables, and Ed with far more holes in his report. We will still need at least 2 hours to finish our work once this problem is resolved.

Tara

On Tue, Jun 21, 2016 at 11:19 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

We are fine with the changes.

I completed MDP revisions tonight with the exception of a few items that I take directly from Ed's ER, and a final pass at pagination/cross-references to make sure they are all current and that there are no awkward page breaks, etc.

Ed is working on the ER now.

If we encounter no unforeseen issues, I expect to submit revised MDP/ER before 11am on Weds (will provide sooner if possible.)

Thank you all for all your help.

On Jun 21, 2016 4:29 PM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:

Hello tara,

Attached is the corrected Venice Beach BID database.

Below, I point out the changes, all of which are highlighted in light green in the spreadsheet:

+ 4286008001- on the original list of modifications- change verified and incorporated into database

+ 4286009091 & 092 - on the original list of modifications- changes verified and incorporated into database

+ 4286012041 - split into 044 & 045- on the original list of modifications- changes verified and incorporated into database

+ 4286028021 to 031- on the original list of modifications- the two buildings involved in this APN range prompted the discussions about methodology, with ultimately no METHODOLOGY changes made . HOWEVER, in the process of looking these parcels over, I noticed that the "original" numbers in the database did not follow the methodology in the MDP when it came to lot frontage and lot area. I corrected these figures

+ 4286027015 to 019- like the immediately preceding group of APNs, the wrong methodology had been applied to lot size and frontage, I corrected those.

+ 4286017026 to 093- similar to the two immediately preceding groups of APNs, the wrong methodology had been applied to frontage, I corrected those figures. The resulting changes in assessments are minimal, with only 093 increasing, and the others decreasing.

+ 4286009135 & 136- these two APNs appeared on the assessor's maps; upon verification in the county's database, it turned out they were added in April; I have added them to the database along with lot, frontage, and building data with the resulting assessments

+ 4286009070 to 075 and 077-081- when I was attending to the previous two additions, 135 & 136 (above), I noticed that an incorrect divisor (12 units instead of 11 had been used), an understandable error since there is no 076, throwing off the count. I adjusted for that along with the two new parcels so the lot and frontage allocation changed for all the parcels in this building. All previous assessment figures decreased.

+ 4286009074 & 081- these are the two parcels I left a voice mail about. They were tagged as zone one, but the building is in zone two, and all the other units in it are tagged as zone two. I also tagged the two new parcels (135 & 136) as zone 2.

I'm pretty sure I've covered everything. Let me know if I have not been clear about any of these points.

Garen

On Tue, Jun 21, 2016 at 9:00 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

We made the changes late last night and sent the revised database just before midnight. We are awaiting final review.

On Jun 21, 2016 7:46 AM, "Miranda Paster" <miranda.paster@lacity.org> wrote:

Good Morning.

Garen finished his review and indicated that you are planning to undo some changes to 2 buildings. He finished the review of Ed's changes from last week on yesterday. Dennis is out today.

What else can we do for you?

Thank you.

On Mon, Jun 20, 2016 at 12:40 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

We are going to lose 3 weeks minimum if the database is not approved asap. We cannot final the ER and MDP until we have an approved database - every table, and many of the in-line numbers change with any change to the database.

My understanding is that Weds is the last day to get this item in the queue to go to Council before a 3-week recess.

Failure to go to Council before recess greatly increases our chances of the BID not starting services on Jan 1 - an outcome that is going to make my head roll, and is going to deeply disappoint the BID's many supporters.

I know Ed is unavailable Tuesday due to medical issues - and I can make some of his ER edit for him, but not all of them.

Please, all, I am asking for your help. This is my top priority; I will do anything within my power. Whatever is easiest and most expedient is really needed, now.

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES
Planning & Entitlements - Political & Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

—
Counting my blessings - Sing and be Happy Today!

http://clerk.lacity.org/stellent/groups/departments/@clerk_master_contributor/documents/contributor_web_content/lacityp_026712.png

—
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621



2016.06.21 Venice database - post-petition & pre-OOI.xlsx
492K